

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-5, 8-14, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hawley (U.S. Pat. No. 5,909,858, hereinafter Hawley). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claims 1 and 12 have been amended to include the "body module adjacent to said centerline is of a greater length than the remaining said body modules, the remaining of said body modules decreasing in length as the remaining of said body modules approach an outer wing portion of said blended wing aircraft." These features were not present in the original claims, but were included in the specification as originally filed, and are therefore not new matter. Applicants respectfully submit that Hawley does not appear to teach or suggest the length of the body modules decreasing progressively as the modules approach the wing of the aircraft. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 12 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant notes that claims 2-5, 8-11, 13-14 and 17-20 each depend from independent claim 1 or 12 and as such, should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for claims 1 and 12 above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdraw of these rejections are respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley in view of Ash et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,065,720, hereinafter Ash). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 depend from either independent claim 1 or 12 and as such, should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Additionally, Applicant notes that the combination of Hawley and Ash cannot teach or suggest Applicant's invention as claimed, since neither Ash nor Hawley disclose body modules of varying lengths.


In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 29, 2004

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael D. Zalobsky  
Reg. No. 45,512

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDZ/JMP